REMARKS

The present remarks are in response to the Office Action dated May 21, 2010, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-16, and 25-30. Although the Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's grounds for rejection, the Applicant has amended claims 1, 11 and included the limitations of recently cancelled claims 25-28 to expedite the prosecution of this patent application. In view of the recent claim amendments, the Applicant requests the Examiner place all claims detailed in the application in a state of allowance. No new matter has been added.

A. Withdrawal of Finality of Rejection

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner finally rejected claim 1, 3-16 and 25-30. If an Applicant files a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in a timely manner as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) with a submission, the Office will withdraw the finality of any Office Action to which a reply is outstanding and the submission will be entered and considered. See 37 CFR 1.114(d).

Although the Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's grounds for rejection, the Applicant has modified the independent claims 1 and 11 to include a variety of limitations. Firstly, the Applicant includes a peer governance tool that allows a member to censor other members with a user created list of blacklisted words that are used in the chat room. Support for this limitation is provided in *inter alia* Figure 11 and Paragraphs 0058 of the Published Patent Application 2002/0097267.

Additionally, the Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 11 to include limitations directed to an administrator tool configured to identify chat conversations that have at least one blacklisted word or phrase to establish community control measures when the members communicate with one another in the immersive online community. Support for this limitation is provided *inter alia* in Figures 12A and 12B and Paragraphs 0060.

Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that substantive claim amendments have been made to the RCE. In view of the amendments and changes to the claims, the Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the finality of the Office Action and place all claims in a condition of allowance.

B. Obviousness Rejection (35 USC Section 103(a))

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, and 3-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over by Chesley et al., (U.S. Patent 7,065,553) hereinafter "Chesley" and in view of Gudorf et al., (U.S. Patent 7,140,045) hereinafter "Gudorf." The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's grounds for rejection for the reasons stated below.

Although the Applicant disagrees with the grounds of the Examiner's rejection, the Applicant has amended the independent claims as described above. Applicant respectfully submits that these claim amendments are made without prejudice to further continuations or continuations-in-part patent applications, and the scope of the claims amendments are limited to the prosecution of this particular patent application.

More particularly, the Applicant has amended the independent claims to include limitations directed to a peer governance tool that allows a member to censor other members with a user created list of blacklisted words that are used in the chat room.

The Examiner relies on Murakami et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,978,292 (hereinafter "Mura") at col. 4, lines 17-53. Additionally, the Examiner relies on Col. 4, lines 31-38 for motivation to combine references and which states that "a decision means that instructs the chat system to expel a chat device that sent a message from virtual space … a user who uses keywords that are not suitable for the chat contents … is expelled from the virtual space." See Col. 4, lines 33-42.

Applicant's amended independent claims teach away from the motivations in Mura because the Applicant ***censors other members with a user created list of blacklisted words.*** Mura fails to teach or describe a user created list of blacklisted words. Additionally, Mura teaches expelling users by site operators, while Applicant claims members censoring other members according to the user created list of blacklisted words. Thus, Applicant fails to teach or suggest the recently amended claim element.

The Applicant has also amended the claims to include the limitation of an administrator tool configured to identify chat conversations that have at least one

blacklisted word or phrase to establish community control measures when the members communicate with one another in the immersive online community. As previously noted, Mura's chat system simply expels the chat device that sent the message. Thus, Mura fails to teach an administrator tool that identifies chat conversations that have at least one blacklisted word or phrase to establish community control measures when the members communicate with one another in the immersive online community.

Further still, the combination of the recently claimed peer governance tool (that is controlled by the user) and the administrator tool (associated with the administrator) are not taught or suggested by Mura, Chesley or Gudorf.

Additionally, the Applicant respectfully submits that Chesley fails to teach *inter alia* compiling a script into compact byte-code representations that are optimized for low bandwidth clients that is inserted into the text of a web page enabling low bandwidth clients to interact in an immersive world and enabling an interface engine corresponding to each client to interpret the byte-code representation. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no reference in Chesley for compiling a script into compact byte-code representations that are optimized for low bandwidth clients.

As previously stated there is no reference made in Chesley to "low bandwidth", "interface engine" and/or "byte codes" and the Examiner has not articulated how Chesley teaches these elements. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not satisfied the prima facie obviousness requirements. Additionally, the Applicant respectfully argues that Chelsey's reference to "significant network bandwidth" teaches away from Applicant's low bandwidth clients.

Further still, Chelsey does not teach or suggest Applicant's claim elements of *inter alia* compiling a script into byte-code representation optimized for low bandwidth clients and enabling an interface engine on the client-side corresponding to each client to interpret the byte-code representation.

Applicant's claim language is directed to constructing a scripting language that compiles into compact byte-code representation of specific behaviors, so that that instead of sending 600 to 4000 bytes of Java Class files, there are about 60 bytes of the compact byte-code representation. In operation, the script is compiled

on the server side into compact-byte code representation, and those compact bytes are actually delivered to the client. The Applicant respectfully submits that this order-of-magnitude decrease, from 600-4000 bytes to 60 bytes, in the amount of information that has to be sent to each chat room would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art and in not described in the prior art.

The Examiner's Action also relies on Chelsey at col 3: lines 1-22 and col 1: lines 45-67 to describe using a scripting language such as DHTML to overcome the limitation of low bandwidth limitations. See Examiner's Action, Page 3. Applicant respectfully disagrees that DHTML could be used to replace the Applicant's Java applet and compact byte-code systems.

DHTML and JavaScript do NOT provide the flexibility of Java to make persistent socket connections back to the chat server; instead they require continually polling the chat server with hundreds or thousands of sequential socket connections that use significantly more bandwidth and are always slower than a persistent Java socket connection. Secondly, the DHTML and JavaScript are NOT optimized for the download size; DHTML and JavaScript are interpreted languages, not compiled languages, and the full source code must be sent to the client, which then compiles and executes the script. Thirdly, DHTML and JavaScript are general purpose object oriented languages and are much less efficient than Applicant's custom-designed support for low-bandwidth virtual worlds.

Finally, with respect to claims 29 and 30 the Applicant has included limitations directed to the user interacting in the chat room using graphical chat bubbles. The Applicant respectfully submits that Chesley, Gudorf, Mura, and the combination thereof also fail to teach the user interacting in the chat room using graphical chat bubbles.

The Examiner's recent action has taken "official notice" of the claimed chat bubble. The Applicant filed the patent application in 2001 and claimed the benefit of a provisional filed in December 2000. Although the "chat bubble" is common in 2010, this does not mean a chat bubble in an immersive on-line community was known in the art in 2000 and 2001. Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits the Examiner is applying improper hindsight reasoning when taking official notice. Simply put, the Examiner needs to provide "articulated reasoning."

C. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that the above-identified patent application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner finds that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully Submitted

Dated: November 22, 2010

/Michael A. Kerr/
Michael A. Kerr
Reg. No. 42,722

Michael A. Kerr
KERR IP GROUP, LLC
9490 Gateway Dr. #104
Reno, NV 89521

Tel: (775) 624-8700